

An Appendix to the foregoing Letter, being  
an Answer to Mr. *Humphrey Hody's* Letter,  
concerning the Canons at the end of the  
*Baroccian Manuscript*.

*Esse posse uno in loco aliquis existimat aut multos Pastores aut  
plures Greges ? Cyprian de Unitate Ecclesie, p. 110.*

*Lingua Christum confessa non sit maledica, non convitiis &  
litibus perstrepsens audiatur ; non contra Fratres, & Dei  
Sacerdotes post verba laudis Serpentis venena jaculetur,  
p. 118.*

SIR,

**Y**OU will readily believe me,  
when I tell you the read-  
ing of your Letter gave  
me unaccountable delight ; The  
clean *Conceits*, various *Inventions*,  
*smooth Stile*, pat *Similes*, just *Al-  
legories*, and sparkling *Strictures* could  
do no less ; and you are too well  
acquainted with the force of your  
own performance, and my *Sincerity*,  
to think I have either need or design  
to flatter : Yet to take off all doubt,  
I will point out some of those par-  
ticulars which gave me the *greatest*  
satisfaction ; and if I now and then  
seem to *laugh* a little, pray consider,  
that great Pleasures are not soon  
quiet : Passions are like Waters,

raise them once, and the Motion  
continues, tho' the Cause be over.

I must confess when in your Pre-  
face to the published *MSS.* you  
had put your self amongst the *Ne-  
thenims*, the hewers of Wood and  
drawers of Water for the Sanctuary,  
I scarce knew my Friend in so humble  
and so *unseasonable* a figure ; but now  
you please to assume *Characters* more  
agreeable to your worth, I can see  
the Generous and the Brave in the  
habit of a *Wrestler* or *Champion* for  
the Church, which under that of a  
*Tankard-bearer* lay too much, and  
too dangerously obscur'd.

In the second Page you enter the  
*Ring* ; Nature hath given you

A

Muscles

Muscles and strength enough, and every way fitted your Person for the *Bele*; but, Sir, you must give me leave to say, that you are not skilled in the Terms and Expressions of the Field: For none ever conjectured he had given his Adversary a fall by the dirtiness of

his hands; indeed that may prove he hath overweighed, and thrust him down on his Face by *Brute* strength, but believe me, dear Sir, a fall comes from a neat Trip, and is always on the Back. Besides 'tis not fair to choose a *Dunghill* to wrestle on, and then complain your Adversary hath bespattered you. Perhaps there were never such foul Examples as the wretched Scribler of your Treatise hath put together; and I am sure a Man cannot stir in them without kicking up a Lye, a Forgery, Idolatry, or Treason in your Face. Of all this I gave you early notice, and had not the Letter been intercepted, I am sure you would not have thought that *Fort* impregnable, one Stone of which I had not left upon another; nor mistaken, for old trusty

*Veterans*, such raw, undisciplin'd, new raised, unarmed *Phalanxes*, which were too empty either to defend or to

affright. Again, you conjecture by your Adversary's *Passion*, that he had a Fall; This was a very unlucky guess, when you was about to show so much your self: *Rapparees*,

*Stabbers to the Heart*, and

*Knockers on the Head* are no very temperate and cool Words, especially when bestowed on Persons of *Exemplary Humility*, and known Meekness. But, Sir, you may remember who formerly called you *Ferocious*; but since you have taken some Degrees, and are commenced *Ferocissimus*, as a learned man said when he read your Letter. In short, Sir, if not only foul Hands, but a dirty Mouth, and a Heart full of Passion will prove a *Foil*; I am afraid you mistook the Person, and thought your Adversary suffered that disaster which fell upon your self. But since you are plentifully bespattered with *Dirt*, you intend to rub it off;

*Page 3.* 'Tis a cleanly design, for which I heartily thank you, for since I must be some time in your Company, I would have it as *inoffensive* as I can: and therefore having taken leave of these filthy Metaphors, I hop'd in plain cleanly *English* to understand the Cause of your present Concernment: But I am no sooner out of the *Mire* than I am thrust into the *Smoke*. After

*Dirt* fly Squibbs and Crack-  
*ers*, of an Ancient Invention, and such as were thrown by the *Philistines* heretofore.

*Page 4.* The next time you enter into Controversie, let me beg you to keep down your Imagination, and not think a little *Penduel* to be a *War*; and then we shall hear less of *Mines*, *Fort*s, *Powder*, and old *Soldiers*, and write and read with less danger than we now

do:

do: Though I must confess it were ingenious (as you told a Friend of yours) to use *Military Expressions* when you was writing about *Canons*.

But now the Air clears again, and I begin to see the Cause of your disquiet: *Pag. 4.* you are accused for not publishing the *Canons* which are written in the very same Hand, and with the same Ink in which the publisht *MS.* is written, and immediately subjoyned to the *MS.* in the same page, without any mark of distinction; and therefore by the *Author* of that Treatise designedly added to it. These *Canons* no way favour the design which you had in publishing that *MS.* (some of them expressly forbidding any Man to separate from a Bishop, unless deprived by the Sentence of a *Synod*;) and therefore were purposely omitted.

To this Charge you reply: The *Canons* were not collected, *Pag. 4.* nor joyned to the Treatise by the Writer of it; and give these *Reasons*. 1<sup>st</sup>, You never thought they were, *pag. 4.* 2<sup>dly</sup>, 'Tis possible the *Stories* & the *Canons* may be collected by two different Persons, though afterward they may be both transcribed by the same Hand, *pag. 5.* 3<sup>dly</sup>, The Treatise hath a peculiar Conclusion of its own, *p. 6.* 4<sup>thly</sup>, Between the Treatise and the *Canons* there comes in an Abstract or Summary of the Treatise, which stands as it were for an *Index*, *p. 7.* 5<sup>thly</sup>, The

writer of the Treatise makes no mention of the *Canons*, never refers to them; and therefore cannot be supposed to have collected and subjoyned them to the Treatise, *p. 7.* And 6<sup>thly</sup>, The *Canons* are not truly pertinent to the particular subject of the Treatise, *pag. 9.*

These you look upon to be *unanswerable* Evidences, both of your *Innocence*, and your Cause too; and sufficient proofs, that the Compiler of the *Stories* was not the Collector of the *Canons*: Upon the strength of these you rise high, despise the Judgments, and condemn the *Reasonings* of other Men; nor is this Presumption unnatural in him who can mistake *Falschood* for *Integrity*, and call *Trifles* Demonstrations. This way of *Writing*, Sir, is no more *Arguing* than *Stammering* is *Speaking*; 'tis only a weak imperfect endeavour after it, but such as *disgraces* what it would imitate.

For suppose, when you first transcribed that Treatise, you did not think the Writer added the *Canons* to it; yet before the *Gr.* and *Lat.* Edition you was sufficiently informed of other Men's Opinions, which 'tis easier to *despise* than to confute. Why then were they concealed, unless you found it necessary to deal with your *Author* as *Painters* do with a Face with one Eye? They show only the *sound* side. The *Stories* lookt plausible enough, but in the *Canons* there was some thing so disagreeable, that it was con-

venient it should be hid.

Again, suppose it possible that the *Canons* might be added by *another* Hand; let me beg you not to conclude they were, for fear of two or three old *Logical* Maxims, which will grow very *testy*, if they once perceive their Authority contemned. Your third and fourth Reason only prove that your *Author's* Conscience began to stare him in the Face, and his *Reading* was at an end: that as he could find none, so he would *forge* no more Examples. But your fifth and sixth Reason, I must confess, would seem to conclude somewhat, had your Author been a Man of any *tolerable* sense: But when I consider how *injudiciously* he hath put his Tales together, and how *inexpedient* many of them are to that purpose for which he hath made them, I can think no proceeding that is idle, unaccountable, and foolish, too mean for him, or disagreeable to his Character.

But to draw this whole *trifling Controversie* into a narrow compass, 'tis evident from *Cotelerius*, that when one *Joseph* was put into the Throne of a Bishop unjustly deposed, many refused to communicate with him; The Composer of this Treatise endeavours to reduce the Refusers by the Examples of some Great Men, who upon the like occasions did not think it lawful to withdraw. But lest bare *Story-telling* should not do the work, he produceth *Canons* which peremptorily

forbid any separation from a *Bishop*: by these he endeavours to support the Chair of the Bishop in *possession*: and thus having Example backt by Precept, he thinks the Refusers must be constrained to a submission: This proceeding is natural enough, there is nothing of force in it; and when I find any thing at the end of a *Treatise* written in the same Hand, immediatly subjoyned to it; which carries no mark of *another* Author, and is agreeable to the Age, and serviceable to the *main* drift and design of the Composer of the Treatise, I must think it added by the same Author, unless you please to furnish me with a Reason to the *contrary*, better than any I have yet met with. Indeed you pretend to offer *one*, when you observe the Author uses his *own* Language in the *Stories*; but *transcribes* the very Words of the *Canons*, pag. 7. But pray, Sir, is it unusual, or is it not necessary to cite the *very Words* of Laws? Your Author might make *Stories*, but sure he was not considerable enough to be a *Canon-maker*; and therefore was bound to those Expressions in which Authority had put them. And your observation, that the Author always uses his *own Style* in the *Stories*, shows you have not yet had leisure to compare them with the Books out of which some part of them is taken.

And

And now, Sir, having considered all you have to say about the Canons, you must excuse me from attending on your Triumph, in which you so indecently lead a very great Man, (the same who gave you Information of every thing you knew concerning this *M S.*) who fell into an unconsiderable mistake, which yet he hath rectified in his answer to your Book, only because he had not leisure to be accurate about Trifles: for the way which you go is too foul for me to wait upon you in. Yet Curiosity will force me as far as your *enchanted Castle*, pag. 19. to see the Issue of that notable Adventure. But here all my Expectation is quite dashed: for when I thought to find the *Knight* armed, mounting the Ramparts, and breaking down the Walls, Modesty comes on, turns him into a *Pioneer*. and sets him to cast up *Works* to enclose a *SPIRIT*, as wise a design as theirs was who hedg'd about a *Cuckboom*.

To be serious. An Acquaintance of mine bids me tell you, your *Guantelet* is taken up, not by a *Party*, but a *Single Person*; and your Challenge is accepted: He hopes you will observe the Laws of Combat, and not bring any *Spells, Charms, or unlawful Weapons* into the Field: (to speak out of Metaphor) that you will be *plain, Civil and Even* in your Writing; That you would leave your Intri-

cate Allegories; your Pride and Insolence behind you; and not indecently fall out of fits of *Raving* into as violent ones of *Prayer*: but dispute like a Scholar, and like a Christian.

He desires likewise you would not produce such Examples, as that repeated one of *Photinus*, pag. 17. nor conclude that *Constantine* did not design to banish *Athanasius* for his Life, because he afterward repented he had banisht him at all, pag. 23. To such Instances and such Conclusions he will think it sufficient to reply, that they ought not to be made or produced by any Man of Honour, Integrity, or Sense.

If you grant him these few reasonable Requests, he is very ready to engage upon the Principles of *St. Cyprian*, and the Practice of that Age; and to make short work of the *Controversie*, thus states it from matter of fact: But I need go no further, you are a wise man, and this hint is enough for you to guess, how I would state it; and you may do it with more safety than I can: but if you know not what I mean, consult the \*

85th page of the 3<sup>d</sup> Grand Question, and then guess how I would state it, and the matter of fact being so stated, then let the Que-

\* This was no legal Remark, because Edward the 2<sup>d</sup> was alive, and lawful King (or else Edward the 3<sup>d</sup> could never have been so) in the time of that first Parliament of Edward the 3<sup>d</sup>, and consequently Edward the 3<sup>d</sup> was at that time an Usurper, and the Proceedings of that Parliament null and void.



tion be, *Whether the Expulsion of the Bishops, and the placing of new ones in their Sees, by an Act of State, and without a Synodical Sentence, for violating such New Oaths, be not Schismatical?* The Case is truly what I dare but hint to you, and you may begin the Dispute as soon as you please; provided you procure us the same freedom and safety to answer fully to the point, as you take to Challenge and Object.

And before (to use your modish Phrase) I subscribe a *Vale*, I must beg you to pass by *one small Mistake*

in my last Letter (if ever it comes to your Hands) about *Josiah* the Presbyter, which yet I think I have corrected in the Margent; and in requital I shall take no notice of *twenty* greater in yours. I shall not examine your Criticism about *disorder*, nor tell the World you produce, p. 42. for your own Reading what you gather up from *Cowles*'s Observation. And besides all this, I shall own the Obligation, admire this single Instance of good Nature and Condescension, and continue

Your Faithful Friend

and

Most Humble Servant.

Jan. 1<sup>st</sup>. 1691.

---

FINIS.

